

Common Characteristics of Selectees MECP Board Applicants

1. Candidates clearly “broke out” on Performance Evaluations. The applicants consistently showed “down and to the right” trends or consistent EP ratings throughout their careers. In the few cases where this was not as clear cut (*junior personnel and some CPOs*), the Performance Evaluation write-ups, CO endorsement, LORs and/or academic history strongly supported their leadership potential and ability to succeed.
2. Personal statements were clearly articulated. Applicants clearly demonstrated their understanding of their future roles as a Navy nurse in addition to a Navy Officer.
3. Proven (Leaders) track records. Selectees possessed breadth of experience, diverse backgrounds and demonstrated strong leadership in unique roles requiring strong leadership, increased responsibility/challenges. (Sailors of Year/Quarter from highly competitive pools, maintained focus on goals while taking SEA/Shore and arduous duty assignments, didn’t miss earning one or even more Warfare Designators and sought additional experience to learn about prospective communities, etc.)
4. Consistent “written portrait” of the applicant. Candidates’ whose packages quickly floated to the top, had no disconnects between the CO Endorsement, Performance Evaluation write-ups and trait marks. Appraisal Interviews and Letters of Recommendation. Interview Appraisers echoed the same message.
5. Focused packages. These packages left no doubt that the applicant had a nursing career in mind and the experts in their chosen programs supported the applicant. The Interview Appraisals and Letters of Recommendation were current and prepared by experts representative of the applicant’s chosen program.
6. Packages lacked “Head Scratchers”: These packages left no room for board members to wonder “what happened?” or “why is this item missing?” Examples: missing PRT scores when provided previously failed PRTs with no apparent explanation. Service record discrepancies left uncorrected for several years, Appraisal Interview Sheets missing marks by interviewer, no Warfare Designator when the opportunity existed to earn one, CO ranking on the application was not explained in the CO’s written endorsement if there were multiple applicants (no break-out of his/her candidates).
7. “Well Rounded” applicants. Showed to be career orientated, not just working a job in order to get a degree or commission. For those junior selectees, they quickly distinguished themselves by being LPOs, or Early promotes and sought assignment to high visibility programs and innovative projects. Varied tours to include operational (FMF, Overseas, Spec Ops, Big Deck, etc).
8. Academically sound. These packages had either proven academic track records or indicators of future academic success. Strong in science academically, took tough courses and made good grades in those subjects
9. Personal “Wow” statements. CO’s and Interviewers were obviously compelled to take time to hand-write or type comments not routinely seen on other packages. “I trust this man with my family “, “Press 100 NOW”, “Candidate Seaman Jones possesses EVERY TRAIT of a Naval Officer, etc.
10. Packages were neat and stellar administratively. These packages were concise, conservative in preparation (no card stock or heavy weight paper) and content was accurate and easy to follow. Free of excess information and neat. Exception to the excess: While LORs were not required, it was noticed when a candidate had none.
11. *Candidates personal statements were free from obvious grammatical errors, i.e. proper punctuation and free From missed spelled words.*
12. Letters of explanations for all adverse remarks, i.e. failed classes, dropped courses, PRT’s, ect was provided.
13. If the candidate was not a hospital corpsman did he/she volunteer to obtain health care experiences.